DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 145 SP 005 003

TITLE	Evaluating the 1969 LTI-TTT Site Visitation Procedure. Aperiodic Report: Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Evaluation. No. 2.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	69p.; Submitted to Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Program Evaluation, *School Visitation, *Teacher Educator Education, *Teacher Educators, *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

This report describes the history of the total LTI-TTT (Leadership Training Institute--Trainers of Teacher Trainers) site visitation procedure, including how it affected various groups and how these groups reacted to it. The report begins by discussing the evaluator's concept of evaluation and proceeds to describe the background condition, activities, and outcomes of site visitation, both as they were intended by visitation planners and as they actually occurred in practice. Although the evaluation includes a description of the congruence between what was intended and what was observed in the way of background conditions, activities, and outcomes, it focuses on the observed outcomes and how they were judged by various groups including project directors, site visitors, and evaluators. The sources of data were 1) meetings and telephone conversations with LTI and USOE personnel and the staff of CIRCE (Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation) before the site visits; 2) documents issued in relation to the TTT program; 3) observations at a site visitor briefing session; 4) questionnaires issued to site visitors after the briefing session and after the site visits; and 5) telephone interviews with TTT project directors after the visits. Appendixes include the site visitor questionnaire with a summary of the resulting data, and the site visitor briefing postal cards with a summary of the resulting data. [A related document is ED 041 832.] (MBM)

ED052145

APERIODIC REPORT: TRAINERS OF TEACHER TRAINERS (TTT) EVALUATION

NO. 2

EVALUATING THE 1969 LTI-TTT
SITE VISITATION PROCEDURE

JUNE 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

An evaluation of the prior conditions, activities, and consequences associated with the 1969 Leadership Training Institute - Trainers of Teacher Trainers (LTI-TTT) site visitation of selected TTT projects.

Submitted to CONSORTIUM OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
(CIRCE)
270 Education Building, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Telephone: (217) 333-3771

SP005003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Overview	1
Purpose of Evaluation	3
Sources of Evaluation Data	5
Background Conditions, Purposes, and Rational of the LTI-TTT Site Visitation Procedure	6
Intended Transactions	8
Intended Outcomes	9
Observed Antecedent Conditions	9
Observed Transactions	12
Recruitment	12
Briefing Session	15
Site Visitation	21
Reporting	27
Observed Outcomes	28
Appendix A. Site Visitor Questionnaire	
Appendix B. Summary Data from Site Visitor Questionnaire	
Appendix C. Site Visitor Briefing Postal Cards	
Appendix D. Summary Data from Site Visitor Briefing Postal Cards	

EVALUATING THE 1969 LTI-TTT SITE VISITATION PROCEDURE[1]

Overview

This report is an attempt to describe the history of the total LTI-TTT site visitation procedure, including how it affected various groups and how these groups reacted to it. The report begins by discussing the evaluator's concept of evaluation and proceeds to describe the background conditions, activities, and outcomes of site visitation, both as they were intended by visitation planners and as they actually occurred in practice. Although the evaluation includes a description of the "congruence" between what was intended and what was observed in the way of background conditions, activities, and outcomes, it focuses on the "observed outcomes" of visitation and how various groups judge these outcomes.

The intended outcomes of the LTI-TTT site visitation were classified into two broad groups: those pertaining to "training and assistance" and those pertaining to the building of "political support" for the TTT Program. The training and assistance outcomes were intended for both local project staffs and for the site visitors themselves. The major generalization that the evaluation data supports is that objectives pertaining to building the political support of the program were more fully achieved than those pertaining to training and assistance, especially training and assistance at the project level. The data show that the site visits were often perceived (by project directors) to be of some positive value with regard to project training and assistance, but it also

[1]Special recognition is due to Gary A. Storm for his assistance in preparing this report.

shows that visits were often perceived to be activities which simply "interfered" with more important project operations. By contrast, there is much evidence indicating that the site visits were a great success from a political point of view. Visitors were very impressed by TTT, regarding it as "an innovative, socially relevant program with high education merit which is making a significant difference in teacher training and American education generally." Testimony of this sort from individuals who are recognized as national leaders of the groups they represent (Education and Liberal Arts faculty and administrators, public school personnel, local community people, and students) is undoubtely of potential political value.

In addition to these major "intended" outcomes, there were outcomes of site visitation not originally intended, both positive and negative. Among the most important positive outcomes of this sort were a) the demonstration that site visits could be used effectively for purposes other than "evaluation," i.e., to disseminate information about and build political support for the National TTT Program, b) an increased awareness on the part of LTI personnel of the importance of considering social-psychological factors in planning group activities when the sub-groups involved are as diverse as those represented in TTT, and c) the knowledge that individuals chosen to represent groups as broad ranging and ill-defined as the parity groups in TTT feel qualified and comfortable in assuming these roles. Among the most important negative unintended outcomes of site visitation were a) a growing confusion in the minds of project directors over the function of LTI in TTT ("Is LTI's function one of training and assistance, evaluation, both, or what?"), and b) interference with CIRCE's efforts

to conduct an effective independent evaluation of the National TTT Program.

In evaluating their own impressions of the outcomes of site visitation as a whole, the evaluators became aware of the possibility that the disruption of project activity caused by the site visitations combined with the project directors' rather low estimate of the utility of the visits for their projects might cause internal strains that could in the long run counteract the positive political gains of site visitation. If such a possibility became an eventuality, it would only be because LTI and USOE personnel who planned the site visits were not effective in communicating the primarily political nature of site visitation goals to project directors and their staffs. The evaluators believe that internal strains that stem from the site visits could be reduced even now by a clear and frank statement from LTI-TTT explaining the reasons why visitation was undertaken and the gains that have resulted from it.

Purpose of Evaluation

According to our conception of the evaluative process, the purpose of any evaluation is to *describe* as fully as is thought feasible and worthwhile the program or activity being evaluated. This description might include prior conditions or "antecedents," activities or "transactions," and consequences or "outcomes" of the program, both as they are "intended" by the program staff and as they are actually "observed" in operation. A complete evaluation also describes the *standards* used and *judgments* made to evaluate the program by individuals and groups

who are affected by it. In evaluating the Leadership Training Institute - Trainers of Teacher Trainers (LTI-TTT) use of site visitation, we perceived the program staff to be the people in LTI-TTT and the TTT Branch, Division of College Programs, BEPD-USOE, who participated directly in planning and administrating the site visitation. The chief groups affected by the site visits, in addition to the program staff, were the site visitors, project staff members visited, and people in TTT who were not directly involved in the site visits. These groups and their recorded activities constituted the major sources of data for our evaluation.

Our evaluation plan, then, included describing:

1. Perceived conditions (antecedents) which prompted people in LTI and USOE to conceptualize and initiate the site visitation, intended purposes (outcomes) of the site visitation, and activities (transactions) intended to achieve these outcomes.
2. Congruence between these "intended" antecedents, transactions, and outcomes and those which were actually "observed" as site visits took place.
3. Existing standards for conducting effective site visits (a "site visit methodology"), and congruence between these standards and the observed site visitation practices.
4. Judgments about the merits and shortcomings of the site visitation made by people involved in or otherwise affected by visits.
5. Attitudes (including judgments) of site visitors concerning the National TTT Program, both before and after their participation in a site visit.

Sources of Evaluation Data

There are many sources of data for evaluating the use of site visits by LTI-TTT. The major sources of data were:

1. Meetings of CIRCE staff members with LTI and USOE personnel prior to the actual site visits (e.g., the LTI meeting on September 27, 1969, at which site visitation procedures were discussed).
2. Conversations, face-to-face and by telephone, of CIRCE staff members with USOE, LTI, and CONPASS personnel (e.g., a conversation at the University of Illinois with Dr. Nathan Pitts about the role of LTI in BEPD).
3. Documents of various kinds issued throughout the history of the TTT program (e.g., position papers on LTI and the goals of TTT issued by Russell Wood, Harry Rivlin, Donald Bigelow and others).
4. Observations by five CIRCE staff members at the Site Visitor Briefing Session in Chicago, and written reports of these observations.
5. Postal card questionnaires administered shortly after the Chicago meeting to prospective site visitors in attendance.
6. Site visitor questionnaires administered to actual site visitors after the site visit.
7. Analysis of the Site Visitor Reports and of Walter Crockett's "Report on TTT Site Visits."
8. Phone interviews with TTT project directors who have received continued support for 1970 - 71 about the value of the visitation.

Background Conditions, Purposes, and Rationale of the LTI-TTT Site Visitation Procedure

The site visits that were organized by the LTI-TTT in September and October and carried out in November and December of 1969 seem to have been undertaken in response to several needs felt by LTI and USOE personnel at the time (some of which were related to the presumed functions of LTI). The general purpose of the LTI's within Bureau of Educational and Personnel Development (BPED) is to "train on a long term basis a cadre of project directors who, in turn, will design and direct projects of excellence in particular program areas both in terms of efficiency and effectiveness." [2]

The LTI-TTT site visitation concept seems to have evolved as a means of serving this training function in two ways. First, it served as a means by which experts representing the various parity groups in TTT (including student participants) could be brought together to observe projects in their beginning stages, to help project personnel view themselves and their projects more objectively, and to make suggestions about how projects might be improved when improvements were thought necessary. This objective of the site visit seemed to emerge from an awareness that TTT projects were newly organized, just beginning to take form, and thus "susceptible to change and improvement on the basis of intelligent and constructive criticism."[3] It was also believed that the

[2]From position statement of Leadership Training Institutes issued by Russell Wood, Deputy Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE, January 31, 1969.

[3]Walter Crockett. "Report on TTT Site Visits," submitted to Leadership Training Institute (LTI), Fordham University, February, 1970.

site visit would initiate "self-appraisal activities" on the part of project staffs that would be especially instructive and valuable at this stage of their development.

A second way the site visit intended to serve the basic training function of LTI-TTT was by collecting information about the existing status of TTT projects: what objectives they were actually pursuing, how much progress they were making, what common problems they were encountering, etc. This information could be used by LTI in designing future training activities for project personnel (through the TTT Clusters or by other means) and by USOE personnel in describing and justifying the TTT Program to HEW, Congress, and the Administration in Washington.

As the last sentence implies, the LTI-TTT site visit was undertaken for reasons other than training alone. Another motive behind the site visit seems to have been a desire to spread knowledge about the TTT Program to key people in education, the arts and sciences, the public schools, and local communities throughout the nation. Part of this motive might be explained in terms of a desire to create a "talent pool" of people familiar with TTT who could be relied upon for consultation or other forms of assistance in the future, but another part must be explained in terms of a desire to increase the base of effective political support for the National TTT Program. Being able to say that 160 key people drawn from the previously mentioned groups were highly supportive of the TTT Program would undoubtedly assist in serving this purpose.

The LTI-TTT site visit, then, emerged in response to several needs perceived by LTI and USOE personnel, some pertaining to training, others to disseminating knowledge about the TTT Program, creating a "talent pool" for future assistance, and increasing the effective political support for the Program.

Intended Transactions

To implement the site visits, it was the intent of LTI and USOE personnel to recruit approximately 40 five-man teams, each composed of a representative from the arts and sciences, education, the schools, the community, and students. Ideally, these site visitors would be selected from all geographic regions in the country and from groups with a wide variety of racial, ethnic, and cultural characteristics. Special concern was expressed about recruiting individuals who would effectively represent the diverse kinds of communities served by TTT projects. The site visitors recruited were to be brought together in Chicago for a 1-1/2 day briefing session in October to meet with team members and to learn about the goals of the TTT Program, the purposes of the site visit, use of the Report Form, techniques for site visiting, sources of information at the site, and other administrative arrangements. The visits themselves were to be two days in length and to occur sometime during the months of November and December of 1969; the teams were to arrange a time most suitable to all concerned with project directors. After observing the project in operation and interviewing selected individuals, each site visitor was to record his or her observations on a 15-page report form and submit this report to the team leader who was to prepare a separate report summarizing the views of the team as a whole. The individual

reports and the summary team reports were to be sent to Dr. Walter Crockett at the University of Kansas for analysis, interpretation, and summarization. Dr. Crockett and his staff were to prepare a final report on the major findings of the site visits for LTI-TTT, copies of which, along with copies of the individual site visitor reports, were to be sent to the directors of projects that were visited.

Intended Outcomes

The outcomes intended by LTI-TTT have already been identified implicitly in our earlier discussion of the conditions and purposes which initiated site visitation. To review them briefly, the intended outcomes include:

1. Providing objective feedback and useful suggestions from qualified observers to projects concerning "where they are", "what progress they are making," and "what improvements could be made."
2. Fostering "self-appraisal" activity on the part of project directors and their personnel.
3. Spreading knowledge about TTT among key people in education, the arts and sciences, the public schools, and local communities.
4. Developing a "talent pool" of people from these areas that can be relied upon for future consultation and assistance.
5. Increasing the base of effective political support for the TTT Program.

Observed Antecedent Conditions

As plans for the site visitation actually materialized, it was obvious to the evaluators that the political purposes of the site visit

had become paramount. This meant that the site visit was being viewed (and valued) increasingly by the program staff as a means to *collect information* about the actual achievements of projects and to *obtain testimony* from influential experts concerning the value of the TTT Program.[4] Information and testimony of these kinds could be used to justify the TTT Program to BEPD, HEW, Congress, and the Administration and to lay the foundation for its support in the future. The training functions of the site visit, while not by any means ignored, appeared to be relegated to a position of lower priority. It may well be that the training functions of the visits were minimized by USOE because the Cluster arrangement -- a mechanism unique to TTT -- was felt to be fulfilling some of these functions. Needless to say, the relation and coordination between LTI and TTT Clusters is at best ambiguously defined.

This shift in priorities from training to political objectives could be detected at the LTI meeting on September 27, 1969. Although this meeting had been called to plan site visitation "procedures" (the training "purposes" of visitation being already established), comments made by Dr. Donald Bigelow and other USOE personnel in attendance indicated that they were supporting the site visitation primarily for its political value. This does not imply, of course, that they were disinterested in the training functions. Differences between LTI, TTT Cluster Directors, and USOE conceptions of the purposes of visitation were visible and these

[4]Part of the desire to collect information about the "actual achievements" of projects seems to stem from an apprehension on the part of USOE personnel that TTT was being perceived as a program with ambiguously defined goals. With information about the actual accomplishments of existing projects, a clearer statement of the "actual goals" of the TTT Program could be formulated (deduced).

differences resulted in some confusion about the purposes of the visitation among those present at the meeting. The active involvement of USOE personnel in the latter stages of the site visitation planning both in Washington and Chicago provides evidence of the growing preeminence of the political purposes of the visit and, incidentally, helps explain some of the confusion that began to exist in the minds of project directors concerning the purposes of the site visits at this time.

Further evidence of the priority attached to the political purposes of the site visit is provided by comments made by Dr. Mary Jane Smalley at a Cluster meeting in Seattle, Washington early in November, 1969. At this meeting, Dr. Smalley told project directors and their staff members that the purpose of the site was not to evaluate projects, but to introduce a large group of influential people in education, the liberal arts, schools, and communities throughout the nation to the TTT Program.[5] These comments also seem to indicate that USOE personnel (at least Dr. Smalley) detected some confusion about the purposes of site visitation in the minds of the project people and wanted to do something to reduce it.[6]

In short, the training functions of site visitation that were originally "intended" by LTI came to be stressed less and less as plans and preparations for the visitation "actually materialized". This lack of congruence between "intended" and "observed" conditions appears to

[5]Observations of the West Coast Cluster Meeting by CIRCE staff members, November 7-9, 1969, Seattle, Washington.

[6]It could be argued that the purposes of the visitation were intended to be purposefully vague until the visitation had been conducted. The alternative strategy would have been to explicitly inform the site visitors before their visitations that they were being asked to participate for the purpose of broadening the base of support for the TTT Program. The consequences of such a strategy would have obviously negated the use of a site visitation procedure as a vehicle for obtaining the desired outcome.

explain part of the confusion that existed among project directors and others concerning the purposes of site visitation.

Observed Transactions

Recruitment. LTI personnel were able to rely strongly on contacts within BEPD and USOE to recruit site visitors. As a result, the recruitment can be characterized as largely "in-house," and the people recruited as people who were familiar with USOE and BEPD programs and site visit procedures. A large percentage of the site visitors (79%) had some knowledge of TTT prior to being recruited for the visitation and a significant percentage (28%) had a direct connection with TTT other than as a site visitor.[7] All of these facts seem to indicate that the goals of visitation pertaining to increasing the base of knowledge, assistance, and political support of TTT might have been more fully achieved had the recruitment process been done a little more systematically and over the span of more time with a deliberate effort to recruit "new" people. It might be added that if the recruitment did in fact succeed in getting "new" people to participate as site visitors, i.e., people not closely affiliated with BEPD and USOE in the past, then the results of the Site Visitor Questionnaire which show a large proportion of people

[7]Data from the CIRCE Site Visitor Questionnaire (see Appendix A for a copy of the instrument and Appendix B for a summarization of the data) indicate that 79 percent of the people (exclusive of the student group) who eventually participated in the visits had heard of TTT prior to being contacted to serve as a site visitor (Education - 90%, L.A.S., 83%, Schools - 72%, Community - 72%); 28 percent had direct connection with some aspect of the TTT Program other than as a site visitor. The fact that more education and liberal arts representatives than school and community representatives had heard of TTT prior to being recruited indicates that visitation planners were more successful in widening the base of knowledge of TTT among school and community people than among education and liberal arts people.

having heard of TTT would serve as evidence that TTT was widely known prior to site visitation. It is quite unlikely, however, that the site visitors recruited were "new" in the sense used above. A high percentage of them should have been expected to have heard of TTT given the recruitment practices that were employed.

Two central problems that planners in LTI and USOE had to face with regard to recruitment were those of "representativeness" and "matching" site visitors with special knowledge or expertise with sites requiring such knowledge or expertise. The problem of representativeness consisted of making sure that people recruited to represent the various parity groups in TTT were really qualified to do so. This problem was especially difficult in the case of recruiting visitors to represent "the community," a very broad-ranging and nebulously defined group. Because the TTT Program focuses on the educational needs of various "disadvantaged" minority groups (which, by the way, a majority of the site visitors found to be true -- see question "12" on the CIRCE Site Visitor Questionnaire), a special effort was made to recruit leaders from these groups who had a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds. The evaluators are not aware of any official count of the number of site visitors recruited from various minority groups to represent "the community," but a rough count taken by CIRCE observers at the community representative meeting at the Briefing Session in Chicago showed that of approximately 30 community representatives present, 9 were Negro, 4 were Spanish-American, and 3 were American-Indian (16 of 30 came from stereotyped minority groups). On the whole, very little dissatisfaction was expressed by the site visitors concerning the "representativeness" of recruitment.

Apparently, individuals with very different backgrounds and professional roles feel capable and comfortable in assuming roles as representatives of groups as broad in scope as "professional educators," "arts and science professors," "public school people," and "community leaders."

Dissatisfaction was expressed, however, by community representatives over the "matching" job that had been done by site visitation planners. Several community representatives resented not being assigned to sites which were dealing with community problems into which they had special insight. Some visitors suggested that assignments to specific sites should have occurred after the Chicago meeting. The evaluators feel that a better job of matching site visitors with sites could have been done if a brief data sheet had been prepared and sent to individuals recruited and to sites to be visited. The data sheet to site visitors could have requested biographical information on the visitors and information about their special interests and skills, while the data sheet to sites could have requested information on their size, state of development, program focus, and other characteristics which, when matched with site visitor characteristics, would have provided a more rational and effective means of assigning individuals to particular sites. Here is a good example of where pressures to get the site visitation done as fast as possible resulted in dissatisfaction with the procedure on the part of participants and a probable sacrifice of effectiveness.

Considering the actual outcome of recruitment procedures, i.e., the people finally recruited, the evaluators feel the planners of the site visitation should be commended highly. The abilities and personal

qualities of individuals recruited to represent each of the parity groups were most impressive. Comments praising the quality of the group recruited to serve as site visitors were recorded repeatedly by CIRCE staff members at the Chicago Briefing Session and can be found in responses to the postal card questionnaires administered after the session (see Appendix C for a copy of this instrument and Appendix D for a summarization of the procedures used to administer the instrument and the findings).

Briefing Session. If there is any one thing that characterized the Site Visitor Briefing Session in Chicago on October 22 and 23, 1969, it was the lack of congruence between what was intended in the way of activities stated in the agenda and what actually took place. This is not to say that this lack of congruence was necessarily bad or that damaging consequences followed from it; it just existed. As was stated earlier, the purposes of the Briefing Session included allowing site visitors to meet the other members of their teams and to learn about the goals of the TTT Program, the purposes of the site visit, use of the Report Form, techniques for site visiting, sources of information at the site, and certain administrative arrangements. These purposes were to be achieved in various meetings throughout the 1-1/2 day session.

The purpose of the first evening meetings at which representatives from the various parity groups met separately was to introduce the site visitors to the general goals of the TTT Program and to the purposes of site visitation *per se*. The decision to have representatives from the various parity groups meet separately appears to have stemmed from a desire to allow groups to develop some sense of commonality and identity

before they encountered each other in open debate on sensitive and controversial issues. Session planners seemed to share a fear (unrealistic as it may have been) that the community group, especially, might be intimidated by the other groups unless they were given a chance to learn something about the TTT Program and the community's role in it prior to meeting with all groups in open session. There was also some fear that visitors representing colleges of education might feel threatened by the whole concept of parity, because traditional programs of teacher training have rarely involved groups other than educators themselves. Meeting separately would allow educators to get some clarification of the meaning of parity and its implications for their role and status in TTT.

In his address to the arts and science representatives the first evening, Dr. Saul Cohen warned that the decision to meet separately the first night seemed inconsistent with the ideal of parity (effective communication across groups) and predicted that possible misunderstandings might arise.[8] He could not have been more prophetic.

At the same time Dr. Cohen was addressing the arts and science people on the nature of TTT and the general purposes of the site visit, Mr. Anthony Gibbs was trying to achieve the same objective with the community group. What resulted from the two meetings was quite different. LTI personnel at the community meeting did not succeed in communicating the "non-evaluative" purpose of the site visit. Large numbers of community representatives were openly skeptical about the sincerity and real

[8]CIRCE staff observation of Arts and Science Representatives Meeting at the Site Visitor Briefing Session, Chicago, October 22, 1969.

effectiveness of many government supported programs and doubted that TTT was any different. Many wanted a chance to pass critical judgment on projects that were not successfully addressing the goals of TTT. Such thinking led to a demand for a second site visit approximately six months after the first one: "If we cannot expect much progress at this point, we can at least establish where projects are now, make some suggestions as to where they are weak and how they might be improved, and come back in six months to see if any real progress has been made." An almost unanimous vote was made to refuse to participate in the first site visit unless LTI would guarantee a second visitation.

By contrast, much time in the "education" meeting was spent trying to clarify the actual roles of various parity groups in the operation of a good TTT project. Should the "non-educator" serve solely in an advisory capacity, or in an operational capacity? If in an operational capacity, what particular roles can -- "should" -- non-educators play? Representatives of the public schools discussed a variety of subjects at their evening meeting including the nature of parity and problems of educating the disadvantaged, but most of their attention seemed to be focused on the mechanisms of and philosophy behind site visitation. The group was especially concerned about how to avoid being perceived as "evaluators" by project staffs.

Attempts were made to clarify and stress the importance of the "learning and training" purposes (as opposed to "evaluative" purposes) of the site visit at the morning session the next day, but the more vocal and militant representatives of the community did not back down on their request for a second site visit and the "evaluative" purposes

it implied. After much active discussion which reduced Dr. Crockett's presentation time to a few moments and thus did not allow him to go through and discuss the Report Form which site visitors were to use in guiding their observations and judgments at the sites, Dr. Dustin Wilson, USOE, announced that a second site visit would be possible for any teams who felt they wanted to make one. The site visitors had their first and only chance to meet with the other members of their teams during lunch on the second day. The afternoon session adjourned early after an hour and one-half of general question, answer, and discussion period.

In a letter accompanying a Site Visitor Questionnaire returned to CIRCE, a representative of the liberal arts at the Chicago Briefing Session expressed disapproval with the way TTT-USOE representatives "were so solicitious of the militant line" at Chicago and did not allow enough time "for the task of the site visitors to be analyzed and put in any kind of meaningful perspective." This comment, along with observations made at the Briefing Session have led the evaluators to believe that the Chicago experience should be heeded by LTI and USOE personnel as a warning of what can happen if more forethought is not given to the problem of dealing with sensitive, but aroused and volitile minority group representatives in "face-to-face" group situations in the future. We are not suggesting that special attention be exerted to discovering how to "avoid" controversial issues or to skirt or subvert meaningful participation by community representatives -- such behavior would be a basic contradiction of TTT objectives. We are merely suggesting that more thought be given "ahead of time" to misunderstandings and conflicts

that "could" (and likely "would") develop from scheduling certain patterns of events and encounters. Generally speaking, it is our belief that introduction and orientation activities at large meetings of this sort should be addressed to and involve the whole group. When expressed in such "general sessions," differences in perceptions, understandings, or values (priorities) associated with sub-group allegiance will become visible early and groups might learn that their views are not the only ones that must be considered in resolving the issues at hand. When groups meet separately before meeting together, group differences tend to become reinforced and serve as barriers to inter-group communication and cooperation when all groups eventually do meet together. In short, we believe that LTI and USOE personnel should become more sensitive to the social-psychological dimensions of planning meetings which involve diverse groups of people like those participating in TTT.

Immediately after the Chicago Site Visitor Briefing Session, CIRCE sent postal card questionnaires designed to get information and judgments about the Briefing Session and TTT generally to all site visitors who attended the meeting. What follows is a list of what the evaluators consider to be some of the most important aspects of the Site Visitor Briefing Session based on the visitors responses to the postal card questionnaires and the confirming observations by CIRCE staff at the Session.

1. Site visitors rated the luncheon meeting with team members as the most valuable meeting during the two day session. This fact plus comments made by project directors after the visits about the lack of preparation (planning and organization) by

site visitors prior to the visits seem to indicate that more time should have been set aside for team meetings and work.[9] Perhaps a "workshop-style" design would be more appropriate for future site visitation-training sessions.

2. Confusion about the purposes of the visit was expressed by site visitors after the Briefing Session. Visitors understood the main purposes of the visits to be purposes centering around *project improvement* and *evaluation* ("seeing if the goals concerning parity, etc. were being reached"), but several other purposes were identified as important. Much of this confusion might have been avoided if everyone would have been oriented to the purposes of the visit <u>together</u> the first evening.

3. There was extensive dissatisfaction expressed by site visitors about the way the Briefing Session prepared them in the following areas: a) knowledge of site projects, b) techniques for site visiting, c) sources of information at sites, and d) use of the Report Form. Most of these session weaknesses might have been reduced if Dr. Crockett and his assistants had been given more time to discuss these areas of concern and answer questions about them.

4. Two-thirds of the site visitors who received postal cards asking them whether they were satisfied with the Brieting Session indicated that they "were satisfied." Approximately 50 percent

[9]Data from CIRCE administered phone interviews of 1969-70 TTT Project Directors whose projects were approved for funding in FY 70-71. A copy of the instrument will be included in a following Aperiodic Report.

of these visitors also indicated that their attitudes toward federally supported programs had improved.

It is interesting to note in passing how site visitors representing the various parity groups ranked the importance of these groups in "their own ideal teacher training program." (See Appendix D, Card 1, Number 2.) The community representatives saw community people and students as most important in teacher training programs, and university affiliated people as least important. College of Education representatives saw their colleagues and public school people as most important and community people as least important. Liberal arts representatives saw their colleagues as playing the "least" important role in teacher training programs! The polorization between College of Education representatives and community representatives that these data reveal was also witnessed at the Briefing Session. Educators seemed to oppose non-professionals, while community people opposed professionals. Community representatives repeatedly expressed the attitude and belief that "educators have failed too long."

Information about site visitor's perceptions of and judgments about the TTT program was also collected on the postal card questionnaires, but this information will be discussed in other contexts of this report.

Site Visitation. As was reported in Dr. Crockett's report on the site visits to LTI, the site visits began in early November and continued through the second week of December. Most reports were sent to Dr. Crockett by the second week in January; a few were received as late as February 6.

"Forty TTT projects were visited, though illness and unexpected conflicts of schedules prevented each project

being visited by a complete five-member team. In fact, only 16 projects were visited by five-member teams; in 12 instances only four team members could attend, in another 12 cases there were only three members present, and for one project only two site visitors could appear. Thirty-six representatives of the public schools took part in these visits, as did 36 professors of education, 34 professors of liberal arts and sciences, 34 community representatives, and 27 students who were enrolled at the time in TTT projects."[10]

These statistics clearly show that there was a significant "lack" of congruence between what was intended concerning the numerical composition of teams and what actually occurred. Fortunately, the proportion of visitors representing the various parity groups was not affected much by the losses in actual site visitor participants. There are no data to suggest whether any of the people recruited to visit sites could not (or would not) do so for reasons other than "illness and conflicts of schedules." No one who was recruited and did not participate reported doing so out of dissatisfaction or hostility toward the TTT Program or toward the way the site visits were handled. One project director whose project was not visited said that he "felt slighted" over the fact. When the director asked LTI why his project

[10]Walter Crockett. "Report on TTT Site Visits," submitted to Leadership Training Institute (LTI), Fordham University, February, 1970.

had not been visited, he was told that an earlier visit by CIRCE staff members had served the same evaluative function as the LTI site visitation. This conversation revealed not only that there was a lack of congruence between intended and observed site visitation activities (all projects were not visited as was intended), but also that there was confusion among LTI representatives about the purpose of at least some of CIRCE's activities. The CIRCE visit to the project in question was not intended to be evaluative in any way; it was designed to introduce CIRCE staff members to a typical TTT project in an effort to obtain a more realistic impression of the TTT Program as a whole.

The statistics cited above from the Crockett Report do not indicate how many site visitor changes were made between the Briefing Session in Chicago and the actual site visits, but many of the site visitor questionnaires that were sent to people identified as site visitors at the Briefing Session were returned with comments indicating that the individuals had not participated and that others had been found to take their place. CIRCE's task of meaningfully evaluating the site visitation procedure was complicated considerably by the site visitor changes that occurred. In the end, all site visitors received CIRCE questionnaires (to the best of our knowledge), but many received them more than a month after the visits had occurred.

CIRCE has little information concerning the actual "mechanics" of the site visit -- how long the site visitors were actually on the site, who they interviewed, what they observed, etc. According to Dr. Crockett, the site visitors typically "arrived at the place to be visited the night before the visit proper was to begin and met together to coordinate their

activities. They then spent two days conducting interviews and making observations. To maximize the number of individuals interviewed and context observed, site visitors carried out the majority of their observations individually. Toward the end of the second day they met again as a group to share their impressions and to compose a team report which the team leader transmitted to the LTI. At the end of their stay, most teams met with the project director and other interested parties, to discuss the most salient of their observations."[11] The extent to which this summary description of "what happened" is based on empirically collected evidence is unknown. CIRCE does have evidence from telephone interviews with project directors after site visitation had occurred that several site visitation teams did not meet with members of the project staff to discuss their findings prior to leaving the site. Several project directors negatively criticized site visitors for not meeting with them and their staffs before leaving the site.

CIRCE does have evidence from the Site Visitor Questionnaire that suggests the existence of some confusion about the purposes of site visitation in the minds of the site visitors. Although most of the site visitors indicated that a major purpose of site visitation was either to "assist the project staff in viewing their own activities from an outsider's perspective" or to "describe what the project is doing and how it is doing it," a smaller but significant proportion (20%) indicated that a major purpose of visitation was "to evaluate the effectiveness of the National TTT Program." Approximately five

[11]Walter Crockett. "Report on TTT Site Visits," submitted to Leadership Training Institute (LTI), Fordham University, February, 1970.

percent of the visitors believed that a major purpose was to "make a judgment about whether the project should be refunded."[12] The first two of the above purposes are clearly "non-evaluative" in nature while the last two are clearly "evaluative". Some of this confusion over purposes can no doubt be explained by failures at the Chicago Briefing Session to communicate the intended purposes of visitation. But some of this confusion might also be explained by the novel way in which LTI and USOE used site visitation in TTT.

"Technically speaking, a site visit is the act of interviewing a person who has submitted a research proposal. It consists of several competent people visiting an investigator in his natural habitat in order to clarify aspects of a written proposal and to generate information permitting a more complete evaluation. The visitors are convened as a panel of experts representing the interests of the potential sponsor. Their qualifications lie in their expertise."[13] Normally site visits are conducted for an "evaluative" purpose: to collect supplementary information (beyond that provided in proposals) used in making funding decisions. The fact that the LTI-TTT site visits were conducted for a variety of purposes (see discussion of "Intended Outcomes" above) none of which were presumed to be "evaluative" in the sense used here, i.e., used to provide information for funding decisions, may explain part of the site visitors confusion concerning the purpose

[12]See item number "4" of the Site Visitor Questionnaire in Appendix A of this report.

[13]Jorden, Thomas E., "Significant Differences, Site Visits," Educational Researcher, Official Newsletter of the American Educational Research Association, XXI: January, 1970, p. 2.

of the site visit, especially since it is estimated that approximately two-thirds of the visitors had served as site visitors before for some agency. The purposes of the LTI-TTT site visits were clearly intended to be evaluative only in a "formative" sense, i.e., used to provide feedback to the projects and to LTI that would be useful in improving the TTT program(s). Using the site visits as a means for developing a talent pool that might be called upon for assistance in the future and for spreading the base of political support for TTT appears to be a rather novel use of site visitation of educational programs. The mere fact that such novel use of site visits may have lead to some confusion as to their purposes in the minds of participants does not negate the value of those novel uses of site visits. To the extent that the site visits achieved the outcomes they were intended to achieve, LTI-TTT should be complimented on their creative use of site visit methodology.

Before closing this discussion about confusion over the purposes of site visitation, it should be noted that LTI and USOE personnel could not and did not openly proclaim the more political purposes of site visitation to site visitors themselves. Just because purposes such as those relating to spreading the base of knowledge and political support for TTT or developing a talent pool that could be relied upon for assistance in the future were not communicated to the site visitors does not mean that they did not exist. Neither does this mean that such political of "future training" purposes should have been made explicit. As was pointed out earlier, USOE personnel stressed these latter purposes of site visitation at a Cluster meeting of project

directors and their staffs at Seattle. It is quite apparent that LTI and USOE personnel stressed different purposes of site visitation to different groups involved in the program. Such behavior, in itself, explains part of the confusion over the purposes of site visitation in the minds of visitors and other groups in TTT.[14]

Reporting. Empirical evidence of the congruity between intended and actual reporting procedures is provided by the number and kinds of reports that were turned in. It will be recalled that each team member was intended to file his own report following the format of the 15-page Report Form and the team leader was to file a separate report summarizing the findings and judgments of the team as a whole. This procedure was generally followed. However, in a few instances, the visitors compiled a comprehensive fully-integrated team report and did not file separate individual reports. At the same time, a few teams in which only two or three visitors appeared did not file a team report but simply submitted an individual report from each team member.[15] The instances of deviation from the intended pattern did not seem to harm significantly the amount or quality of the information conveyed to LTI and the projects.[16]

[14]CIRCE's telephone interviews with project directors indicate that directors themselves were confused about the purposes of site visitation. Twelve different purposes were identified by project director in these interviews: In descending order of frequency, the five most mentioned purposes were: 1) evaluation by LTI, 2) to increase visitors knowledge of TTT, 3) for visitors to make suggestions for improvement, 4) for LTI to compile information on the status of the National TTT Program, and 5) to match intents with observations.

[15]Walter Crockett. "Report on TTT Site Visits," submitted to Leadership Training Institute (LTI), Fordham University, February, 1970.

[16]One project director did indicate that he received only a brief letter from the team leader, and another that he received no report at :11 (CIRCE telephone interview). Both directors viewed the visits as useless" to their projects.

One could speculate that this deviation between intended and observed procedures might have been reduced had more time been given to discussing the reports and reporting procedures at the Briefing Session in Chicago.

Observed Outcomes

To make any kind of summative judgment about the site visitation procedure as a whole, it would be necessary to rank in importance the various purposes or "intended outcomes" identified earlier, collect evidence bearing on the achievement or these outcomes, and finally add and subtract any positive and negative value stemming from outcomes not originally expected but which emerged as a result of the visitation. As evaluators, we cannot rank the importance of various outcomes (either intended or unintended), but we can try to describe as objectively as possible the outcomes that have occurred as well as certain standards used and judgments made to evaluate site visitation by various groups involved in and affected by it. In this section of the evaluation report, we will do the latter. Our focus will be on the intended outcomes identified earlier (see page 9) and on how various groups perceived and ranked the importance of these outcomes. But we will also identify and discuss some unintended outcomes of the site visitation.

One way of subdividing the five intended outcomes (or objectives) described earlier is to categorize them as outcomes pertaining to "project training and assistance" and as outcomes pertaining to "political support of the program". Using such a classification scheme, objectives No. 1 and No. 2 (page 9) of this report can be classified as outcomes pertaining to "project training and assistance" while

objectives No. 3, No. 4, and No. 5 (page 9) can best be classified as outcomes pertaining to the "political support of the program".

The primary generalization that our evaluation data seems to support is that outcomes pertaining to the "political support of the program" were more fully achieved than those pertaining to "project training and assistance."

There are several kinds of data that support this generalization. By far the most persuasive data are those which come from telephone interviews conducted with TTT project directors after site visitation had occurred.[17] It is clear from these interviews that many project directors felt that the visits were of questionable value as vehicles for "project training and assistance". To illustrate, in rating the usefulness of the information found in the reports filed by site visitors, one-third of the project directors indicated that it was of "no" use; nearly sixty percent of the directors said that the reports had made "no" difference in what their projects have been doing. In rating the impact of the visit on their projects, more project directors indicated that the visit had "little" or "no" impact (33 percent) than "much" or "great" impact (25 percent). The remaining directors (42 percent) indicated that the visits had "some" impact on their projects. It is important to note that a few directors who indicated that the visit had much or great impact viewed this impact in a negative manner. By way of comparison, the site visitors rated their impact on the projects

[17]These telephone interviews occurred after the first site visitation of the projects had been conducted, and after a majority of the second visits had been made.

they visited less extremely, with approximately 60 percent viewing their visit as having "some" impact.[18]

Although the evidence just cited seems to suggest that the achievement of "training and assistance" objectives was limited, one should not conclude that site visitation "failed" with regard to training and assistance. After all, two-thirds of the project directors interviewed after the visits said that the information in the site visitor reports "was" useful and one-fourth indicated that the visit and the report had had "much" or "great" impact on what their projects were doing.

When asked what their projects had gained from the visits, only five directors said "nothing", or that they "had learned nothing new". The vast majority of directors could identify positive gains derived from the visits. Among the most often mentioned gains were: the visit -- reinforced efforts to extend community involvement; helped to clarify objectives and made us aware of digressions; improved communications throughout the university about TTT; provided a good general outside perspective, useful suggestions, and moral support for staff; and increased our "leverage" on the university administration.

When site visitors were asked to identify what kind of impact the visits had on the projects they visited, they most often listed a) increased project staff's awareness of and need for involvement of community groups in project planning and operation, b) increased self-appraisal, re-examination, and articulation of the intended and actual

[18]Views of site visitor as to the impact their visit had on the project they visited: Great impact - 1%, Much impact - 20%, Some impact - 59%, Little impact - 19%, No impact - 1%.

goals and operations of the project by the staff, c) increased the visibility of TTT both within and outside the project setting, d) increased communications among project staff and participants and resolved some internal project conflicts, and e) increased awareness of the accountability of the project to USOE.

All of this evidence suggests that there were positive training and assistance gains from the visits and furthermore, that the nature of these gains were viewed very similarly by the two groups most involved in visitation. It also suggests, however, that even though positive training and assistance gains can be identified, the achievement of training and assistance objectives can only be rated as "moderate".

By contrast, there is much evidence to show that the purposes pertaining to building "political support of the program" were extensively achieved. Although our earlier discussion called attention to the fact that limited numbers of "new" people were recruited to participate in the site visits and that the goal of spreading the base of knowledge and political support of the TTT program was thus only partially achieved, there is much evidence that those who in fact participated as site visitors were prestigious people in their respective domains and that they were strongly supportive of the TTT program after having participated in the site visitation. The results of the last half of the Site Visitor Questionnaire indicate the potential political value of the site visitation procedure.

Among the most impressive results of the Site Visitor Questionnaire in this regard are the following:

1. Fifty-eight percent of the site visitors ranked the TTT program as more socially relevant than "most" federally supported

educational programs; 10 percent ranked TTT as more socially relevant than "any other" such program. In other words, two-thirds of the site visitors viewed TTT as "above average" in social relevance. Only 4 percent ranked the program "below average". (It is particularly impressive that the site visitors representing the "community" saw TTT as a very socially relevant program.)

2. Fifty-eight percent of the site visitors rated the overall educational merit of the projects they visited as "above average", that is, "high" or "very high". Representatives of Colleges of Education and public schools -- people who might in one sense be most able to judge the "educational merit" of a project -- gave the highest ratings to TTT projects on this dimension. Only 8 percent of the site visitors rated the educational merit of TTT projects as "below average".
3. Eighty-six percent of the site visitors rated projects they visited as "somewhat innovative" or above (fifty-one percent rated projects as "rather" or "extremely" innovative). Representatives of the public schools most often gave the projects high ratings on "innovativeness".
4. Sixty-three percent of the site visitors saw TTT as doing an above average job of training "change agents": people who will be able to bring about changes in education in the future. Community and education representatives were most skeptical about the effectiveness of TTT in this regard, however.

5. Sixty-six percent of the site visitors indicate that relative to other teacher training programs they know about, TTT is "generally better". (Only 4 percent believe that TTT is "generally poorer".) Again it is the College of Education and public school people who rate TTT most highly on the dimension in question.
6. Fifty-six percent of the site visitors indicated that the concept of TTT is broadly influencing the training of teachers "much" or "highly," as opposed to "some," "little," or "not at all."
7. Fifty-five percent of the site visitors indicated that they had made a continuing commitment to some aspect of TTT. This represents a substantial increase in support for TTT since only 37 percent of the visitors had a direct connection with TTT prior to the visitation. The greatest increase in support came from liberal arts representatives, only 9 percent of whom had a direct connection with TTT prior to visitation as compared to 46 percent after the visit.
8. Ninety-five percent of the site visitors said they would serve TTT in a consultant role again. This offers strong evidence that the objective concerning the development of a talent pool was achieved.
9. Finally, when asked "If a friend of yours asked you to write a letter in support of the National TTT Program, could you in good conscience be supportive from what you know about the program?", 90 percent of the site visitors replied "yes".

The community group was most hesitant to answer this question positively, but 83 percent of the community group indicated that they could be supportive.

In short, TTT was perceived by site visitors as an innovative, socially relevant program of high educational merit which is making a significant difference in teacher training programs and American education generally. Such testimony from people who are recognized as leaders within the groups they represent -- colleges of education, liberal arts, public schools, local communities, and students -- cannot help but be interpreted as politically influential and valuable. It serves as strong positive evidence that the political objectives of site visitation were largely attained.

Even though definite training and assistance "gains" can be identified as stemming from the site visits, the evaluators believe that after interviewing all project directors the general tone of their reaction to the site visits can best be described by a statement like, "The visits were part of the system and something that had to be put up with, but they were of little practical value." In their more honest moments, directors seemed willing to admit that from their point of view, the visits "simply interfered with more important operations," that is, had low priority compared to other TTT functions. A few directors, but not many, saw the possible political value of site visitation and thus the round about importance of site visitation to the projects. The evaluators see a real possibility that these particular site visits may prove to be of short range political value, but, "by" straining "in-house" (intra-program) relations through the disruption of important day-to-day

operations in the projects, they may turn out to be thorns-in-the-side of effective long-term progress.

There were several other outcomes of site visitation which were probably not planned or expected, some positive and some negative. On the positive side, as was mentioned earlier, the LTI site visitation served to demonstrate that site visits can be used effectively for purposes other than "evaluation" (collecting information and judgments useful for funding decisions). LTI used site visitation well to spread the base of knowledge about and political support for the TTT Program among influential representatives of all the parity groups in TTT. It is true that the political gains of site visitation might have been counteracted somewhat by increased friction in internal relations within the program, but the evaluators believe this kind of friction could be avoided in future efforts of this sort if a more open and concerned effort were made to communicate the political nature of the objectives of visitation to project directors and their staffs prior to visitation. All in all, the unintended outcome of demonstrating a novel use of site visitation methodology has to be considered a desirable one.

Another positive, unintended outcome of site visitation is the increased awareness on the part of LTI and USOE officials in TTT of the importance of attending to social-psychological variables in planning group activities involving representatives of groups as diverse as those in TTT. The group dynamics of the Chicago Briefing Session and of some of the site visits themselves have no doubt sensitized visitation planners and administrators to the importance of "thinking through" more

carefully the merits and demerits of alternative types of training sessions and visitation procedures from the point of view of promoting or maintaining good interpersonal communication. The evaluators have made some suggestions which might improve effective communication earlier in the report.

A related "gain" that has come out of site visitation is the knowledge that individuals selected from groups as diverse and ambiguously defined as "professional educators," "liberal arts professors," "public school personnel," "local community people," and "students" seem to feel comfortable and qualified in assuming the role of "representatives" for these groups. This fact is good to know in planning site visit or other "group" activities in the future.

On the negative side, in addition to interfering somewhat with what many project directors considered higher priority activities, the site visitation interfered with CIRCE's efforts to conduct its independent evaluation of the National TTT Program. Prior to LTI's decision to conduct site visits, CIRCE had planned site visits to all or at least many of the TTT projects. Once the LTI site visits materialized, CIRCE had to alter its evaluation strategy and replaced site visits with hour-long telephone interviews with project directors. During the course of these interviews, several comments were made by project directors to the effect that they resented having to take time for interviews of this sort after having just completed two days of "evaluation" by LTI. (As it turned out, many projects had been visited a second time by LTI just prior to the telephone interviews.) There can be little doubt that hostile or resentful attitudes of the sort implied by such comments

affect the objectivity and hence the quality of responses to a structured interview.

Several project directors expressed doubt that site visitation could achieve "training and assistance" objectives as well as "clustering" could and wondered why CIRCE (instead of LTI) was not conducting evaluative site visits. By pursuing objectives which appeared to overlap with both those of clustering and the CIRCE evaluation, site visitation undoubtedly increased the confusion in the minds of project directors over the role LTI is playing in TTT (training?, assistance?, evaluation?, all of these?). This increased confusion on the part of project directors about the role of LTI in TTT must be considered another negative, unintended outcome of site visitation. The evaluators see a great need at this point in time for LTI personnel to better conceptualize their own role in TTT and to communicate the results of their analysis to project directors and to all those people involved with the program. Special efforts are needed to clarify LTI's relation to, and use of, Clustering.

In summary, then, the primary positive outcome of site visitation was political: it involved the effective dissemination of knowledge about the TTT Program to influential people representing each of the parity groups in TTT and the emergence of positive attitudes toward the program among these representatives. Other positive outcomes included improved "self-knowledge" on the part of local project staffs (a knowledge of where their strengths and weaknesses were), increased visibility and power of projects within their local settings, heightened awareness on the part of LTI-USOE personnel of the importance of social-

psychological variables in planning group activities involving sub-groups as diverse as those in TTT, knowledge that individuals selected to represent groups as broad ranging and ill-defined as those in TTT can assume such a role "comfortably", and a demonstration that site visitation can be used effectively for purposes other than evaluation.

The major negative consequence of the site visits seems to be the resentment harbored by local project staffs over having to interupt important activities for site visits which they perceived to be of little practical use. Such resentment probably stems in part from poor communication on the part of LTI-USOE personnel to project directors and their staffs concerning the primarily political nature and value of site visitation objectives. This strain in internal program relations could probably be relieved by a frank, post-hoc statement by LTI explaining the reasons why site visitations was undertaken and the gains that have been derived from it. Two other negative outcomes of site visitation are increased confusion in the minds of project people concerning the role of LTI in TTT and interference with CIRCE's efforts to conduct an effective evaluation of the National Program. In the evaluators judgment, the positive outcomes of site visitation definitely outweigh the negative outcomes. The final judgment about the value of the total site visitation procedure must be left, of course, to the readers of this report and to any and all affected by the LTI operation.

APPENDIX A: Site Visitor Questionnaire

SITE VISITOR QUESTIONNAIRE
Trainers of Teacher Trainers Evaluation

This questionnaire is completely confidential. Responses will be treated in summary form and names will not be associated with specific replies. Names are to be provided only to facilitate coordination of returns.

DO NOT WRITE

1. Name _____ Date _____
   (last) (first)

2. Had you heard of TTT prior to your being contacted to serve as a site visitor?

   Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 11

   3. *(If yes)* Indicate the primary source.

   _____ ( )12 ( )13

4. In addition to participation as a site visitor, do you have a direct connection with any aspect of the TTT program?

   Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 14

5. Personally, how would you characterize the purpose of the site visit? *(Check no more than two or three)*

   A. To make a *judgment* about whether a project should be refunded . . . . . 1[ ] 15

   B. To *assist* the project staff in viewing their own activities from an outsider's perspective. . . . . 2[ ] 16

   C. To *evaluate* the effectiveness of the TTT National Program . . . . . 3[ ] 17

   D. To *describe* what the project is doing and how it is doing it . . . . . 4[ ] 18

   E. To *learn* more about the TTT National Program. . . . . 5[ ] 19

6. How much impact do you think your visit had on the project you visited? *(Circle the number)*

1	2	3	4	5	20
Great Impact	Much Impact	Some Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	

DO NOT WRITE

7. Indicate one important way your visit affected the project you visited.

_____ ( )21

_____ ( )22

_____

8. To what extent is the project you visited making progress toward the goal of involving community people in the task of training better teachers?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	23

9. . . . toward the goal of involving arts and science people . . . ?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	24

10. . . . toward the goal of involving public school people . . . ?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	25

11. . . . toward the goal of involving TTT participants (students) . . . ?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	26

12. Relative to other federally supported educational programs, how would you rate the social relevance of the TTT program?

More relevant than any other . . . . . 1[ ]	27
More relevant than most. . . . . 2[ ]	
Of average relevance . . . . . 3[ ]	
Less relevant than most. . . . . 4[ ]	
Least relevant . . . . . 5[ ]	

13. The primary focus of the TTT project I visited is on training teachers to better serve our educationally disadvantaged population.

DO NOT WRITE

True . . 1[ ] False . . 2[ ] Undecided . . 3[ ] 28

14. Ignoring for a moment the social orientation of the TTT project you visited, how would you rate the overall <u>educational</u> <u>merit</u> of this project?

1	2	3	4	5	29
Very High Merit	High Merit	Average Merit	Low Merit	Very Low Merit	

15. A project might or might not have "educational merit," but would you consider the project you visited to be <u>educationally</u> <u>innovative</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	30
Extremely Innovative	Rather Innovative	Somewhat Innovative	Hardly Innovative	Not at all Innovative	

16. *(If at least somewhat innovative)* Name one major way.

_____ ( )31

_____ ( )32

_____

17. Do you think TTT projects are doing a good job of training educational <u>change</u> <u>agents</u>: people who will be able to bring about changes in education in the future?

Yes, very good job . . . . . 1[ ] 33
Yes, fairly good job . . . . . 2[ ]
Average job. . . . . 3[ ]
No, fairly poor job. . . . . 4[ ]
No, very poor job. . . . . 5[ ]

18. Relative to other teacher training programs you know about, how does TTT compare?

It is generally better . . . . . 1[ ] 34
It is about the same . . . . . 2[ ]
It is generally poorer . . . . . 3[ ]
No basis for comparing . . . . . 4[ ]

19. How do you see the concept of TTT broadly influencing the training of teachers?

1	2	3	4	5
Highly	Much	Some	Little	Not at all

DO NOT WRITE 35

20. My attitude toward federally supported programs is more favorable than it was before making the site visit.

Agree . . 1[ ] Disagree . . 2[ ] Undecided . . 3[ ] 36

21. Have you made a continuing commitment to an aspect of the TTT program since participating in the site visit?

Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 37

22. *(If yes)* Indicate the nature of the commitment.

_____ ( )38
( )39

_____ ( )40

23. *(If no)* Would you be willing to assist an aspect of the TTT program in a consultative role?

Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 41

24. If a friend of yours asked you to write a letter in support of the TTT National Program, could you in good conscience be supportive from what you know about the program?

Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] Undecided . . . 3[ ] 42

25. Name a person with similar work responsibilities as yourself who favorably views the TTT program.

Name _____

Title/Position _____

Address _____

26. Please indicate a primary aspect of the program on which this person bases his favorable attitude.

_____ ( )43
( )44

_____ ( )45

APPENDIX B: Summary Data from Site Visitor Questionnaire

SUMMARY DATA FROM SITE VISITOR QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a summarization of responses obtained from the Site Visitor Questionnaire administered during February and March, 1970 by the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE) as part of its attempt to evaluate the National Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program. Respondents of this questionnaire were persons from around the country who had participated in visiting one of 40 TTT projects during late 1969. The respondents roughly represent the arts and science, teacher education, school, and community sectors in equal proportions of the persons visiting projects. Responses are based on 141 returned questionnaires. This represents 85 percent of the total group from the above sectors that participated in the site visit.

The response summarizations are, for the most part, presented as frequencies (f) and per cents (%) by the parity groups participating in the site visitation. Not all the responses to the questions in the Site Visitor Questionnaire have been summarized because a few of the questions are not relevant to the purposes of this report. Hence, there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the question numbers in this summary and those in the Site Visitor Questionnaire.

1. Had you heard of TTT prior to your being contacted to serve as a site visitor?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	26	90	24	83	23	72	21	72	22	100	116	82
No.	3	10	5	17	9	28	8	28	--	--	25	18
Total	29	100	29	100	32	100	29	100	22	100	141	100

2. Respondents who had heard of TTT prior to their serving as a site visitor indicated the primary source of their information about TTT as (in decreasing frequency): projects in which they were participants, USOE personal contacts and publications, local TTT projects, conferences, LTI, professional colleague or friend, and educational journals.

3. In addition to participation as a site visitor, do you have a direct connection with any aspect of the TTT program?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	9	31	2	7	11	34	8	29	22	100	52	37
No	20	69	26	93	21	66	20	71	--	--	87	63
Total	29	100	28	100	32	100	28	100	22	100	139	100

4. Personally, how would you characterize the purpose of the site visit?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
To judge	2	3	--	--	1	1	3	5	1	2	7	2
To assist	23	36	26	45	30	44	26	39	19	42	124	41
To evaluate	15	23	14	24	11	16	17	25	5	11	62	20
To describe	19	30	11	19	21	30	14	21	16	36	81	27
To learn	5	8	7	12	6	9	7	10	4	9	29	10
Total	64	100	58	100	69	100	67	100	45	100	303	100

5. How much impact do you think your visit had on the project you visited?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Great impact	--	--	1	4	--	--	1	4	--	--	2	1
Much impact	5	18	6	21	4	13	7	27	5	23	27	20
Some impact	16	57	14	50	21	70	15	58	13	59	79	59
Little impact	7	25	6	21	5	17	3	11	4	18	25	19
No impact	--	--	1	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
Total	28	100	28	100	30	100	26	100	22	100	134	100

6. Following are major categorizations of responses made to the question which asked site visitors to indicate <u>one</u> important way their visit affected the project they visited. Response categories are listed in decreasing order of frequency mentioned.

   A. Increased project staff's awareness of and need for involvement of community groups in project planning and operations.

   B. Increased self-appraisal, re-examination, and articulation of the intended and actual goals and operations of the project by the staff.

   C. Increased visibility of TTT both within and outside the project setting.

   D. Increased communications among project staff and participants and resolution of some internal project conflicts.

   E. Increased awareness of the accountability of the project to USOE.

6. (Continued)

F. Other: exchanged information about TTT projects; put project on notice that efforts inadequate; provided outside perspective to project; provided names of resource persons and their use; served as a catalyst for change; brought together for a second time in a year the advisory committee; forced a decision to include more Mexican-American on Board; annoyed site staff, especially the director.

7. To what extent is the project you visited making progress toward the goal of involving community people in the task of training better teachers?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Much progress. .	7	24	5	17	4	12	1	3	3	14	20	14
Some progress. .	8	28	11	38	16	50	14	50	10	45	59	42
Little progress.	9	31	8	27	8	25	8	29	7	32	40	29
No progress. . .	4	14	4	14	4	13	5	18	2	9	19	14
No knowledge . .	1	3	1	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1
Total.	29	100	29	100	32	100	28	100	22	100	140	100

8. To what extent is the project you visited making progress toward the goal of involving arts and science people in the task of training better teachers?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Much progress. .	5	17	7	24	9	28	4	14	5	23	30	22
Some progress. .	12	41	12	41	15	47	17	61	13	59	69	50
Little progress.	9	31	7	24	6	19	7	25	3	14	32	23
No progress. . .	2	7	2	7	2	6	--	--	--	--	6	4
No knowledge . .	1	4	1	4	--	--	--	--	1	4	2	1
Total.	29	100	29	100	32	100	28	100	22	100	139	100

9. To what extent is the project you visited making progress toward the goal of involving public school people in the task of training better teachers?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Much progress. .	15	52	7	24	9	28	9	31	6	27	46	33
Some progress. .	10	35	16	55	19	60	14	48	11	50	70	50
Little progress.	2	7	5	17	2	6	5	17	5	23	19	13
No progress. . .	1	3	--	--	2	6	1	4	--	--	4	3
No knowledge . .	1	3	1	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1
Total.	29	100	29	100	32	100	29	100	22	100	141	100

10. To what extent is the project you visited making progress toward the goal of involving TTT participants (students) in the task of training better teachers?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Much progress. .	10	34	5	18	10	31	6	21	7	32	38	27
Some progress. .	10	34	12	43	15	47	14	50	11	50	62	45
Little progress.	6	21	7	25	3	9	7	25	2	9	25	18
No progress. . .	1	4	--	--	1	3	--	--	2	9	4	3
No knowledge . .	2	7	4	14	3	10	1	4	--	--	10	7
Total.	29	100	28	100	32	100	28	100	22	100	139	100

11. Relative to other federally supported educational programs, how would you rate the social relevance of the TTT program?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
More relevant than any other.	1	4	1	4	5	16	3	12	4	18	14	10
More relevant than most . . .	16	57	21	75	18	58	12	48	10	46	77	58
Of average relevance . . .	10	36	6	21	7	23	7	28	8	36	38	28
Less relevant than most . . .	1	3	--	--	1	3	3	12	--	--	5	4
Least relevant .	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total.	28	100	28	100	31	100	25	100	22	100	134	100

12. The primary focus of the TTT project I visited is on training teachers to better serve our educationally disadvantaged population.

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
True	14	48	16	55	17	53	12	43	11	50	70	50
False.	7	24	9	31	8	25	10	36	9	41	43	31
Undecided. . . .	8	28	4	14	7	22	6	21	2	9	27	19
Total.	29	100	28	100	32	100	28	100	22	100	140	100

13. Ignoring for a moment the social orientation of the TTT project you visited, how would you rate the over-all educational merit of this project?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Very high merit.	2	7	4	14	5	16	6	21	3	13	20	14
High merit . . .	14	48	10	34	18	56	11	39	9	41	62	44
Average merit. .	11	38	13	45	7	22	8	29	9	41	48	34
Low merit. . . .	2	7	2	7	1	3	3	11	1	5	9	7
Very low merit .	--	--	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	1	1
Total.	29	100	29	100	32	100	28	100	22	100	140	100

14. A project might or might not have "educational merit," but would you consider the project you visited to be <u>educationally innovative</u>?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Extremely innovative. . .	3	10	4	14	4	13	4	15	3	14	18	13
Rather innovative. . .	11	38	9	31	16	50	9	33	8	36	53	38
Somewhat innovative. . .	11	38	15	51	7	22	9	33	7	32	49	35
Hardly innovative. . .	3	10	--	--	3	9	4	15	4	18	14	10
Not at all innovative. . .	1	4	1	4	2	6	1	4	--	--	5	4
Total.	29	100	29	100	32	100	27	100	22	100	139	100

15. Following are some themes of educational innovation which were expressed by site visitors. They are summarized and listed in decreasing order of frequency mentioned.

A. Involvement and interaction of different groups (e.g., community, schools, professors, and students) in planning and achieving a common purpose (teacher training program).

B. Involvement of different groups (e.g., professors) in a different setting (public school classroom). Another frequent example mentioned is teachers and students "living-in" a culturally-different setting in which they conduct or receive training.

C. Early involvement of students in field experiences suited to their background and interests as well as the individualization of instruction for students.

D. Interchanging new school teachers with teachers in need of retraining or continuing education.

E. Basing teacher education and certification on performance criteria.

F. Emphasizing human and social concerns in the design of teacher training programs.

16. Do you think TTT projects are doing a good job of training educational <u>change agents</u>: people who will be able to bring about changes in education in the future?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes, very good job	3	12	1	3	7	23	2	7	3	13	16	12
Yes, fairly good job	13	54	16	55	13	42	12	44	14	64	68	51
Average job. . .	4	17	10	35	8	26	8	30	4	18	34	26
No, fairly poor job	3	13	2	7	2	6	5	19	1	5	13	10
No, very poor job	1	4	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	2	1
Total.	24	100	29	100	31	100	27	100	22	100	133	100

17. Relative to other teacher training programs you know about, how does TTT compare?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
It is generally better.	20	71	15	52	22	71	15	56	18	82	90	66
It is about the same.	5	18	7	24	6	20	10	37	1	5	29	21
It is generally poorer.	1	4	2	7	1	3	--	--	2	9	6	4
No basis for comparing . . .	2	7	5	17	2	6	2	7	1	4	12	9
Total.	28	100	29	100	31	100	27	100	22	100	137	100

18. How do you see the concept of TTT broadly influencing the training of teachers?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Highly	2	7	3	10	6	19	6	21	5	23	22	15
Much	13	46	10	35	15	47	8	28	11	50	57	41
Some	12	43	13	45	9	28	12	41	4	18	50	36
Little	1	4	2	7	2	6	3	10	2	9	10	7
Not at all . . .	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
Total.	28	100	29	100	32	100	29	100	22	100	140	100

19. My attitude toward federally supported programs is more favorable than it was before making the site visit.

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Agree.	11	42	11	41	14	47	11	42	11	50	58	44
Disagree	7	27	7	26	6	20	7	27	5	23	32	25
Undecided. . . .	8	31	9	33	10	33	8	31	6	27	41	31
Total.	26	100	27	100	30	100	26	100	22	100	131	100

20. Have you made a continuing commitment to an aspect of the TTT program since participating in the site visit?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes.	13	48	13	46	17	59	16	57	15	68	74	55
No	14	52	15	54	12	41	12	43	7	32	60	45
Total.	27	100	28	100	29	100	28	100	22	100	134	100

21. Would you be willing to assist an aspect of the TTT program in a consultative role?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes.	21	100	18	95	18	95	19	95	8	89	84	95
No	--	--	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	11	4	5
Total.	21	100	19	100	19	100	20	100	9	100	88	100

22. If a friend of yours asked you to write a letter in support of the TTT National Program, could you in good conscience be supportive from what you know about the program?

	Educ.		L.A.S.		Schools		Commu.		Students		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes.	25	92	26	90	30	94	24	83	20	91	125	90
No	1	4	2	7	--	--	3	10	1	5	7	5
Undecided. . . .	1	4	1	3	2	6	2	7	1	4	7	5
Total.	27	100	29	100	32	100	29	100	22	100	139	100

APPENDIX C: Site Visitor Briefing Postal Cards

For each item indicate how you feel about certain aspects of the Site-Visitor Briefing. Check whether you agree, disagree, or are undecided.

	Agree	Disagree	Undecided
1. I understand TTT quite well	( )	( )	( )
2. The purposes of the meeting are clear to me.....	( )	( )	( )
3. The material presented was clear to me.....	( )	( )	( )
4. I know what the purposes of the site-visit are.....	( )	( )	( )
5. My role in the site-visit is clear to me.....	( )	( )	( )

1. For the task facing you in the forthcoming site-visit, indicate for each of the following areas how well the Site-Visitor Briefing prepared you.

Area	Good	Fair	Poor
Knowledge about TTT.....	( )	( )	( )
Purposes of site-visit.....	( )	( )	( )
Use of the Report Form.....	( )	( )	( )
Administrative arrangements.....	( )	( )	( )
Techniques for site visiting.....	( )	( )	( )
Knowledge about site projects.....	( )	( )	( )
Sources of information at site.....	( )	( )	( )

2. Have you previously participated in a site-visit for a state, federal, or accrediting agency?

Yes ( ) No ( )

1. Had you heard of the TTT prior to your being contacted to serve as a site-visitor? Yes ( ) No ( )
2. If yes, indicate the primary source and approximate date. _____

_____

3. Did you have adequate information about the Site-Visitor Briefing before it started? Yes ( ) No ( )
4. If no, what would you like to have known?

_____

_____

5. In general, indicate the extent to which the intended objectives of the meeting were achieved.

5	4	3	2	1
Extremely	Rather	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at all

Briefly indicate what you will look for during the site-visit with respect to each of the following:

1. Institutional Commitment _____

_____

_____

_____

2. Educational and Social Relevance _____

_____

_____

_____

1. In your own words, what are the major purposes of the site-visit. Briefly, please.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How would you personally rank the importance of each of the following groups in your ideal teacher training program? (1 is high, 5 is low)

_____ Community _____ College of Education

_____ Liberal Arts _____ Schools

_____ Student

1. Please describe what was most valuable to you at the Site-Visitor Briefing for preparing you for the site-visit. _____

_____

_____

_____

2. What one thing would have most improved the Site-Visitor Briefing? _____

_____

_____

_____

Given your knowledge of TTT, to what extent do you feel the concept of TTT (parity, relevance, change) is new and different? (Circle one)

5	4	3	2	1
Extremely	Rather	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at all

Are you aware of any teacher training programs (local or national in scope) with similar goals as the TTT Program? If so, describe the most familiar one.

_____

_____

_____

How do you see the concept of TTT influencing American education?

5	4	3	2	1
Highly	Much	Some	Little	None

For each of the five major sessions of the Site-Visitor Briefing, indicate the importance of the session.

Session	Most	Much	Some	Little	No
Evening Group (Parity).....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Morning Orientation (Rivlin and Bigelow)....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Morning Training (Schmieder and Crockett)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Luncheon Meeting (Team).....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Afternoon Discussion (Rivlin and Subleaders).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

For each item indicate how you feel about certain aspects of the Site-Visitor Briefing. In each case, check whether you agree, disagree, or are undecided.

	Agree	Disagree	Undecided
1. I am satisfied with the briefing I had in preparation for the site-visit.....	( )	( )	( )
2. My attitude toward Federally sponsored programs is more favorable than it was.....	( )	( )	( )
3. I can see little advantage of the TTT Program over other teacher training programs.....	( )	( )	( )

Briefly indicate what you will look for during the site-visit with respect to each of the following:

1. Parity _____

_____

_____

_____

2. Change and innovation _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D: Summary Data from Site Visitor Briefing Postal Cards

SUMMARY DATA FROM SITE VISITOR BRIEFING POSTAL CARDS

An important aspect of the LTI-TTT site visitation procedure was the Chicago Briefing Session held for prospective site visitors on October 22 and 23, 1969. The general purpose of the briefing session was to orient the prospective site visitors to the TTT Program and to the purposes and procedures for conducting the project visitations. To assess the contribution this briefing session made to the site visitation itself, data were gathered from the prospective visitors by use of a postal card questionnaire. Each briefing session participant received one of ten different postal cards from the evaluation staff four days after the meeting. Each postal card contained from one to five items, some requiring objective, and other open-ended, responses. Each of the ten anonymous "sub-questionnaires" was sent to an almost equal number of representatives of each of the four parity groups (community, education, liberal arts and sciences, and schools). Because some information was deemed more important than other, different numbers of each "sub-questionnaire" were sent to prospective visitors. The most of any one card sent was 24. The least sent was 12. Caution must be used in interpreting the results of responses to cards sent to only 12 prospective visitors, especially when differentiations are made among parity groups. The total number of postal cards sent was 164. Of these 117 (71%) were returned. No follow-up was made of non-respondents.

Following is a tabular summarization of the data obtained from each of the postal cards. In most instances the data are provided as frequencies by parity group. Occasionally total percentages are also provided

for the response categories. The ratio of respondent returns to the number of postal cards sent is provided for each question of each card.

Card No. 1

1. In your own words, what are the major purposes of the site-visit. Briefly, please.

	Total Frequency
Make suggestions to project for improvement	6
See if goals of TTT are being reached	3
Make suggestions to LTI or TTT for improvement	2
See if parity exists	2
See if project goals are being reached	1
Observe and report promising practices	1

Response Ratio: 15/24

2. How would you personally rank the importance of each of the following groups in your ideal teacher training program? (1 is high, 5 is low)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
Community	3.2	2.4	3.0	1.0
Liberal Arts	3.0	3.6	3.5	3.0
Student	2.5	2.2	2.8	1.5
College of Education	1.2	2.2	3.2	2.5
Schools	1.8	2.0	3.2	2.0

Response Ratio: 15/24. Data reported as mean rankings.

Card No. 2

1. Please describe what was most valuable to you at the Site-Visitor Briefing for preparing you for the site-visit.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
History and other orientation to TTT	--	--	1	--
Comments by community representatives	--	--	3	--
Observe competance of the personnel involved	--	--	--	1
Breakfast meeting for team coordinators	--	1	--	--
Opportunity to meet team members	2	--	--	--
Discussion of role in TTT program	1	--	--	--
Nothing at all	--	--	--	1

Response Ratio: 10/12

Card No. 2 (Continued)

2. What one thing would have most improved the Site-Visitor Briefing?

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
Consulting with visitors before assignments to particular sites	1	--	--	--
Workshops instead of lectures . .	1	--	--	--
More advanced information on nature and background of the program	--	--	--	1
More time to discuss visit with team members.	--	--	1	--
Not losing salary while attending it.	--	1	--	--
Honest motivation of participants	--	1	--	--
Honest dialogue between college personnel and community on problems of education	--	--	--	1
Earlier and more definitive information	--	--	2	--
More guidance on what to look for.	1	--	--	--

Response Ratio: 10/12

Card No. 3

1. Given your knowledge of TTT, to what extent do you feel the concept of TTT (parity, relevance, change) is new and different?

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Extremely	--	3	1	2	30%
Rather.	2	2	3	2	45%
Somewhat.	2	1	1	--	20%
Hardly.	1	--	--	--	5%
Not at all.	--	--	--	--	--%

Response Ratio: 20/24

2. Are you aware of any teacher training programs (local or national in scope) with similar goals as the TTT Program? If so, describe the most familiar one.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
Only those conducted with EPDA . .	--	--	--	1
N.Y.C. Board of Education Auxiliary Educational Career Program . . .	--	--	--	1
A.H.A. History Education Project except no community representatives.	--	--	1	--

Card No. 3 (Continued)

2. (Continued)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
N.D.E.A. Institute	--	1	--	--
Teacher Corps	--	1	--	--
Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program, 1967 (13 colleges in Kansas and Missouri)	--	1	--	--
Tri-University Project	1	--	--	--
Winnetka, Illinois program	1	--	--	--
No single program, but elements in different programs	--	1	1	--
Occidental College in Los Angeles	--	--	--	1

Response Ratio: 11/24

3. How do you see the concept of TTT influencing American education?

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Highly	1	2	2	--	25%
Much	2	2	3	1	40%
Some	1	2	--	2	25%
Little	1	--	--	1	10%
None	--	--	--	--	--%

Response Ratio: 20/24

Card No. 4

For each of the five major sessions of the Site-Visitor Briefings, indicate the importance of the session.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
1. Evening Group (Parity)					
Most	--	--	1	--	11%
Much	--	--	1	1	23%
Some	1	1	1	--	33%
Little	1	1	--	1	33%
No	--	--	--	--	--%
2. Morning Orientation (Rivlin and Bigelow)					
Most	--	--	--	1	11%
Much	2	1	2	--	56%
Some	--	1	1	--	22%
Little	--	--	--	--	--%
No	--	--	--	1	11%

Card No. 4 (Continued)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
3. Morning Training (Schmeider and Crockett)					
Most	1	--	--	--	11%
Much	--	1	--	1	22%
Some	--	1	3	--	45%
Little	--	--	--	--	--%
No	1	--	--	1	22%
4. Luncheon Meeting (Team)					
Most	1	1	--	1	33%
Much	1	1	3	1	67%
Some	--	--	--	--	--%
Little	--	--	--	--	--%
No	--	--	--	--	--%
5. Afternoon Discussion (Rivlin and Subleaders)					
Most	--	--	1	--	11%
Much	1	--	--	1	22%
Some	--	--	1	--	11%
Little	1	2	1	1	56%
No	--	--	--	--	--%

Response Ratio: 9/12

Card No. 5

For each item indicate how you feel about certain aspects of the Site-Visitor Briefing. Check whether you agree, disagree, or are undecided.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
1. I understand TTT quite well.					
Agree	2	1	1	2	75.0%
Disagree.	--	--	--	1	12.5%
Undecided	1	--	--	--	12.5%
2. The purposes of the meeting are clear to me.					
Agree	2	1	1	1	62.5%
Disagree.	--	--	--	2	25.0%
Undecided	1	--	--	--	12.5%
3. The material presented was clear to me.					
Agree	2	--	1	2	62.5%
Disagree.	1	1	--	1	37.5%
Undecided	--	--	--	--	-- %

Card No. 5 (Continued)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
4. I know what the purposes of the site-visit are.					
Agree	2	1	--	2	62.5%
Disagree.	1	--	1	1	37.5%
Undecided	--	--	--	--	-- %
5. My role in the site-visit is clear to me.					
Agree	1	1	1	2	62.5%
Disagree.	1	--	--	1	25.0%
Undecided	1	--	--	--	12.5%

Response Ratio: 8/12

Card No. 6

1. For the task facing you in the forthcoming site-visit, indicate for each of the following areas how well the Site-Visitor Briefing prepared you.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Knowledge about TTT					
Good	1	1	--	1	50%
Fair	2	1	--	--	50%
Poor	--	--	--	--	--%
Purposes of site-visit					
Good	1	2	--	1	67%
Fair	2	--	--	--	33%
Poor	--	--	--	--	--%
Uses of report form					
Good	--	1	--	--	17%
Fair	2	1	--	1	66%
Poor	1	--	--	--	17%
Administrative arrangements					
Good	1	1	--	--	33%
Fair	2	1	--	--	50%
Poor	--	--	--	1	17%
Techniques for site-visiting					
Good	1	--	--	--	17%
Fair	--	2	--	1	50%
Poor	2	--	--	--	33%
Knowledge about site projects					
Good	1	--	--	--	17%
Fair	1	--	--	--	17%
Poor	1	2	--	1	66%

Card No. 6 (Continued)

1. (Continued)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Sources of information at site					
Good	1	--	--	--	17%
Fair	1	1	--	1	50%
Poor	1	1	--	--	33%

Response Ratio: 6/12

2. Have you previously participated in a site-visit for a state, federal, or accrediting agency?

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Yes	3	--	--	1	67%
No.	--	2	--	--	33%

Response Ratio: 6/12

Card No. 7

1. Had you heard of the TTT prior to your being contacted to serve as a site-visitor?

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Yes	3	2	2	--	64%
No.	--	1	--	2	36%

Response Ratio: 11/12

2. If yes, indicate the primary source and approximate date.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
Dick Lawrence and other members of Advanced Administrative Institute, 1966-67	--	--	1	--
University of Miami, 1969.	--	--	1	--
University of Washington TTT program, Spring, 1968.	--	1	--	--
NDEA, November, 1968	1	--	--	--
On initial advisory groups, 1968 .	1	--	--	--
Bigelow and Berndt before establishment of TTT program.	--	1	--	--
USOE, EPDA Guidelines, 1968. . . .	1	--	--	--

Response Ratio: 7/12

Card No. 7 (Continued)

3. Did you have adequate information about the Site-Visitor Briefing before it started?

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Yes	3	1	3	1	73%
No.	--	2	--	1	27%

Response Ratio: 11/12

4. If no, what would you like to have known?

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
Place of visit, team members, date of visit	--	1	--	--
More knowledge of TTT.	--	1	--	1

Response Ratio: 3/12

5. In general, indicate the extent to which the intended objectives of the meeting were achieved.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
Extremely	--	--	1	--	10%
Rather.	3	--	2	1	60%
Somewhat.	--	2	--	1	30%
Hardly.	--	--	--	--	--%
Not at all.	--	--	--	--	--%

Response Ratio: 10/12

Card No. 8

Briefly indicate what you will look for during the site-visit with respect to each of the following:

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
1. Institutional Commitment				
What they proposed	--	1	--	--
Intent to achieve parity	--	1	--	--
Commitment to input from project components	--	--	1	--
To arts and sciences involvement	--	1	--	--
Awareness of direction of project.	--	1	--	--
Course specifically designed for TTT purposes	--	1	--	--
Commitment to approaches shown effective in training teacher educators.	1	--	--	--

Response Ratio: 7/20

Card No. 8 (Continued)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
2. Educational and Social Relevance				
If they are doing what they proposed	1	--	--	--
Indication that institutions will not revert to status quo after TTT ends	1	--	--	--
Designed toward immediate needs of classroom	--	1	--	--
Role of subject matter	--	1	--	--
Role of university, school, community, and liberal arts. .	--	--	1	--
Parity between educators, liberal arts professors, school administrators, and community	1	--	--	--

Response Ratio: 6/20

Card No. 9

Briefly indicate what you will look for during the site-visit with respect to each of the following:

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
1. Parity				
The four groups working together on an equal basis . .	2	2	3	1
Cooperation between school people and community	--	--	1	--
Power of the community	--	--	--	1
Adequate representation from the five constituencies. . . .	--	1	--	--
See if site is doing what was in their proposal.	1	--	--	--
Organizational relationships promoting appropriate equality. .	1	--	--	--
Teaching relevant to people served	--	--	--	1
School, community, and education	--	--	1	--

Response Ratio: 15/24

Card No. 9 (Continued)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.
2. Change and Innovation				
What is different and how is it different	--	1	2	--
Realism of teacher training.	--	2	--	2
Evidence of working toward goals outlined in the proposal	--	1	--	--
Can the program accommodate change	1	--	--	--
Changes in university program, schools, trainers of teachers, and teachers	--	--	1	--
Use of ideas from previous experimentation and projects	--	1	--	--
Anything new that promises higher quality trainers of teachers	--	1	--	--
Actual evidence of change and innovation	--	1	--	1

Response Ratio: 14-24

Card No. 10

For each item indicate how you feel about certain aspects of the Site-Visitor Briefing. In each case, check whether you agree, disagree, or are undecided.

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
1. I am satisfied with the briefing I had in preparation for the site-visit.					
Agree	2	1	3	--	67%
Disagree.	--	--	--	1	11%
Undecided	1	--	--	1	22%

Response Ratio: 9/12

2. My attitude toward Federally sponsored programs is more favorable than it was.					
Agree	1	1	2	--	50%
Disagree.	--	--	1	1	25%
Undecided	1	--	--	1	25%

Response Ratio: 8/12

Card No. 10 (Continued)

	Educ.	L.A.S.	Schools	Commu.	Total %
3. I can see little advantage of the TTT Program over other teacher training programs.					
Agree	--	--	--	--	--%
Disagree.	2	1	3	--	67%
Undecided	1	--	--	2	33%

Response Ratio: 9/12